with the condition that the employees will continue to be in service till completion of their balance service period. These Presses were set up for printing text books of the States under the region. As the State Governments were not able to provide adequate jobs, it was decided to transfer these Presses to the respective State Governments. Upon refusal by the State Governments to accept transfer, decision has been taken to privatize these units.

(d) At present, there is no proposal to hand over these Presses to some other Ministry.

Criteria for Implementing Urban Development Schemes

3024. SHRI T.T.V. DHINAKARAN: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the criteria applied to assess whether an area is urban or rural for implementing schemes under Urban Development;

(b) when the criteria was last revised with the details of revision; and

(c) the scales/methods applied to assess Urban poverty?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI AJAY MAKEN): (a) and (b) Criteria to assess an area as rural or urban is based on census definition for towns/cities. As per 1991 Census, all villages would be classified as urban, which had a population of 4,000 and above, a population density of 400 persons per sq. Km. and having at least 75 per cent of male working population engaged in non-agricultural activity. These criteria have been revised in 2001 Census, which are as follows:

(i) All places with a municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified town area committee, etc.

(ii) A place satisfying the following three criteria simultaneously:

a) A minimum population of 5,000;

b) At least 75 per cent of male working population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits; and

c) A density of population of at least 400 per sp. Km. (1000 per sq. mile)

(c) The definition of urban poverty as adopted by the Planning Commission is enclosed as Statement.

Statement

Poverty Estimates For 1999-2000

New Delhi 22nd February, 2001

The Planning Commission has been estimating the incidence of poverty at national and State level using the methodology contained in the report of the Expert Group on Estimation of Proportion and Number of Poor (Lakdawala Committee) and applying it to consumption expenditure data from the large sample surveys on consumer expenditure conducted periodically by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO). Poverty estimates for the years 1973-74, 1977-78, 1983, 1987-88 and 1993-94 made on this basis were released by the Government of India, Press Information Bureau on 11th March, 1997.

2. The NSSO has now released the key results of the latest large sample survey data on consumer expenditure (55th Round), covering the period July, 1999 to June, 2000 [*See* Report No. 454 (55/1.0/2)]. Two sets of different distributions of consumer expenditure form the 55th Round have been reported because of experimenting with the method of data collection. In the earlier large scale surveys, the NSSO estimated monthly per capital consumption expenditure on the basis of responses using a 30-day recall period though data were collected for some of the non-food items using reference periods of both 30 days and 365 days form the same household. In the 55th round, consumption expenditure on clothing, footwear, medical (institutional) and durable goods were collected by using a 365-day recall period. In the case of all other non-food items, the 30-day recall period was used as earlier. The data regarding consumption of food items were collected by using different reference periods of last 30 days and last 7 days from the same household in that order. The two sets of data so collected were tabulated and the corresponding distributions of persons by monthly per capita consumption expenditure were included in the report, though the data based on 7 days reference period for the food items were collected only for investigating the suitability of the shorter reference period.

3. Since both consumer expenditure distributions have been published, the Planning Commission has estimated poverty from both distributions reported by the NSSO, using the accepted methodology. State specific poverty lines have been estimated using the original State specific poverty lines identified by the Lakdawala Committee and updating them to

1999-2000 prices using the Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL) for rural households and the Consumer Price Index of Industrial Workers (CPIIW) for urban households. These poverty lines are given in Table 1 (*See* below). The poverty lines have then been used in conjunction with each of the two consumption distributions, to estimate the percentage of people below the poverty line (poverty ratio) for each State. As in the past, separate estimates have been made for rural and urban areas for each State, which are then combined into a State level estimate.

4. The consumer expenditure data of the 55th Round on a 30 day recall basis yields a poverty ratio for 1999-2000 of 27.09% in rural areas, 23.62% in urban areas and 26.10% for the country as a whole in 1999-2000 (Table 2). The corresponding figures from the 7-day recall period are 24.02% in rural areas, 21.59% in urban areas and 23.33% for the country as a whole.

5. Although the 7-day estimates used are being reported in the interest of transparency, it should be noted that the NSS Governing Council has not yet decided to switch from the 30-day basis for food items to the 7-day basis. For the present, the 30-day estimates reported in Table 2 are being used as the appropriate estimate of poverty.

6. The change in the methodology regarding the measurement of durable consumer goods from a 30-day recall period in earlier large sample surveys to a 365-day recall period in the 55th Round implies that the 30-day estimate for 1999-2000 in Table-2 (*See* below) may not be fully comparable with the earlier estimate. This fact needs to be kept in mind in assessing trends over time. However, improvement in methodology of collecting data is a continuing exercise.

Table I

State-Specific Poverty Lines in 1999-2000

(Rs. Per capita per month)

Sl. No.	State	Rural	Urban
1.	Andhra Pradesh	262.94	457.40
2.	Assam	365.43	343.99
3.	Bihar	333.07	379.78
4.	Gujarat	318.94	474.41
5.	Haryana	362.81	420.20
6.	Himachal Pradesh	367.45	420.20

Sl. No.	State	Rural	Urban
7.	Karnataka	309.59	511.44
8.	Kerala	374.79	477.06
9.	Madhya Pradesh	311.34	481.65
10.	Maharashtra	318.63	539.71
11.	Orissa	323.92	473.12
12.	Punjab	362.68	388.15
13.	Rajasthan	344.03	465.92
14.	Tamil Nadu	307.64	475.60
15.	Uttar Pradesh	336.88	416.29
16.	West Bengal	350.17	409.22
17.	Delhi	362.68	505.45
	#ALL INDIA:	327.56	454.11

The poverty line (implicit) at all-India level is worked out from the expenditure class-wise distribution of persons and the poverty ratio at all India level. The poverty ratio at all India Level is obtained as the weighted average of the State-wise poverty ratio.

Table II

Number and Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line

By States-1999-2000 (30-*Day Recall Period*)

Sl. No.	States/U.T.s	Rural		Urban		Combined	
		No. of Persons (Lakhs)	% of Persons	No. of Persons (Lakhs)	% of Persons	No. of Persons (Lakhs)	% of Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	58.13	11.05	60.88	26.63	119.01	15.77
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3.80	40.04	0.18	7.47	3.98	33.47
3.	Assam	92.17	40.04	2.38	7.47	94.55	36.09
4.	Bihar	376.51	44.30	49.13	32.91	425.64	42.60
5.	Goa	0.11	1.35	0.59	7.52	0.70	4.40
6.	Gujarat	39.80	13.17	28.09	15.59	67.89	14.07
7.	Haryana	11.94	8.27	5.39	9.99	17.34	8.74
8.	Himachal I Pradesh	4.84	7.94	0.29	4.63	5.12	7.63
9.	J&K	2.97	3.97	0.49	1.98	3.46	3.48
10.	Karnataka	59.91	17.38	44.49	25.25	104.40	20.04
11.	Kerala	20.97	9.38	20.07	20.27	41.04	12.72
12.	Madhya Pradesh	217.32	37.06	81.22	38.44	298.54	37.43
13.	Maharashtra	125.12	23.72	102.87	26.81	227.99	25.02
14.	Manipur	6.53	40.04	0.66	7.47	7.19	28.54
15.	Meghalaya	7.89	40.04	0.34	7.47	8.23	33.87

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16.	Mizoram	1.40	40.04	0.45	7.47	1.85	19.47
17.	Nagaland	5.21	40.04	0.28	7.47	5.49	32.67
18.	Orissa	143.69	48.01	25.40	42.83	169.09	47.15
19.	Punjab	10.20	6.35	4.29	5.75	14.49	6.16
20.	Rajasthan	55.06	13.74	26.78	19.85	81.83	15.28
21.	Sikkim	2.00	40.04	0.04	7.47	2.05	36.55
22.	Tamil Nadu	80.51	20.55	49.97	22.11	130.48	21.12
23.	Tripura	12.53	40.04	0.49	7.47	13.02	34.44
24.	Uttar Pradesh	412.01	31.22	117.88	30.89	529.89	31.15
25.	West Bangal	180.11	31.85	33.38	14.86	213.49	27.02
26.	A&N Islands	0.58	20.55	0.24	22.11	0.82	20.99
27.	Chandigarh	0.06	5.75	0.45	5.75	0.51	5.75
28.	D&N Haveli	0.30	17.57	0.03	13.52	0.33	17.14
29.	Daman&Diu	0.01	1.35	0.05	7.52	0.06	4.44
30.	Delhi	0.07	0.40	11.42	9.42	11.49	8.23
31.	Lakshadweep	0.03	9.38	0.08	20.07	0.11	15.60
32.	Pondicherry	0.64	20.55	1.77	22.11	2.41	21.67
	ALL INDIA:	1932.43	27.09	670.07	23.62	2602.50	26.10

Notes to Table-2

1. Poverty Ratio of Assam is used for Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland and Tripura.
2. Poverty Line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Goa is used to estimate poverty line ratio of Goa.
3. Poverty Line of Himachal Pradesh and expenditure distribution of Jammu&Kashmir is used to estimate poverty ratio of Jammu&Kashmir.
4. Poverty Ratio of Tamil Nadu is used for Pondicherry and A&N Island.
5. Urban Poverty Ratio of Punjab used for both rural and urban poverty of Chandigarh.
6. Poverty Line of Maharashtra and expenditure distribution of Dadra&Nagar Haveli is used to estimate poverty ratio of Dadra & Nagar Haveli.
7. Poverty Ratio of Goa is used for Daman&Diu.
8. Poverty Ratio of Kerala is used for Lakshadweep.
9. Urban Poverty Ratio of Rajasthan may be treated as tentative.

Beautification of Jama Masjid in Delhi

†3025. SHRI JAI PARKASH AGGARWAL: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Delhi High Court had directed Delhi Development Authority in September, 2005 to make an action plan with the help of different institutions for the beautification of Jama Masjid situated in Delhi;

(b) whether DDA has taken any steps till date in compliance with Delhi High Court's decision;

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.